

March 8, 2005
Case No. GP-301314 (2760/11)
Serial No.: 10/046,571
Filed: October 26, 2001
Page 2 of 4

— REMARKS —

Claims 1-17 were rejected as anticipated by Seppanen under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The §102(e) rejection of claims 1-17 is traversed.

In order to maintain this rejection, each and every element of the claimed invention must be disclosed by the reference in at least as great detail as claimed. Because Seppanen does not disclose each and every element, this rejection must fall.

Specifically, Seppanen does not disclose "determining necessary calling prefixes for placing a call from the mobile communication unit to the number to be called via a base station having the received SID code," as claimed in claims 1, 5, and 10. Additionally, Seppanen does not disclose "determining the access number in the database for accessing the desired service via the base station having the received SID code," as claimed in claims 15, 16, and 17.

The claimed invention determines a calling prefix based on a received SID code. In contrast, the reference determines a calling prefix based on a comparison between a telephone number included in a received call signal to numbers for telephones within a network. See, Seppanen, column 27, lines 47-57.

At most, Seppanen discloses that a stored number, i.e. the telephone numbers stored in memory 24 of mobile terminal 10, may include a non-extension number. However, in such embodiments, according to Seppanen, the "memory 31" of the base station 31 is assumed to store similar telephone numbers" for telephones within the network 35. See, Seppanen, column 25, lines 35-67.

Nowhere does Seppanen disclose that the calling prefix is based on a received SID code. Therefore, Seppanen cannot anticipate the instant invention, and independent claims 1, 5, 10, 15, 16, and 17 are patentable over Seppanen for at least this reason.

Claims 2-4, 6-9, and 11-14 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 5, and 10 respectively and are therefore patentable over the prior art for at least the same reasons.

Best Available Copy

March 8, 2005

Case No. GP-301314 (2760/11)

Serial No.: 10/046,571

Filed: October 26, 2001

Page 3 of 4

Further, however, claims 2, 6, 8, 11, and 13 each require searching the database *for the received SID code*. The Examiner correctly does not even allege that this claim element is disclosed by Seppanen. Therefore, claims 2, 6, 8, 11, and 13 are each patentable over the prior art for at least this same reason.

Likewise, Seppanen does not disclose "searching the database for a range of SID codes including the received SID code," as claimed in claims 3, 7, and 12. The Examiner's citation to column 24, lines 8-25 is misplaced, as Seppanen discloses only searching a database of *extension* numbers, not searching a database of *SID* numbers. Therefore, claims 3, 7, and 12 are each patentable over the prior art for at least this same reason.

Similarly, Seppanen does not disclose searching the database for the received SID or searching for a range of SID codes encompassing the received SID code, as claimed in claims 4, 9, and 14. Again, Seppanen discloses only searching a database of *extension* numbers, not searching a database of *SID* numbers. Therefore, claims 4, 9, and 14 are each patentable over the prior art for at least this same reason.

Therefore, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1-17.

Best Available Copy

March 8, 2005
Case No. GP-301314 (2760/11)
Serial No.: 10/046,571
Filed: October 26, 2001
Page 4 of 4

SUMMARY


The Examiner's rejections of claims 1-17 have been obviated by remarks herein supporting an allowance of pending claims 1-17 over the art of record. The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-17 herein fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: March 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,
WILLIAM E. MAZZARA, JR.

GENERAL MOTORS CORPORATION
General Motors Legal Staff
Mail Code 482-C23-B21
300 Renaissance Center
P.O. Box 300
Detroit, MI 58265-3000
Phone: (313) 665-4714

CARDINAL LAW GROUP
Suite 2000
1603 Orrington Avenue
Evanston, Illinois 60201
Phone: (847) 905-7111
Fax: (847) 905-7113


Frank C. Nicholas
Registration No. 33,983
Attorney for Applicants

Best Available Copy